

July 6, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3545

journalistic honorary society. This scholarship honors the memory of the late Herman A. Lowe, whom I knew well as correspondent for the Philadelphia Inquirer and later as head of his own Washington news bureau.

The scholarship was established by Florence Lowe, now well known as producer of Metromedia's "Opinion in the Capital" and other television programs, and her brother, Bernard Segal, a nationally known Philadelphia lawyer and close personal friend of mine. It was conceived as a fitting tribute to a reporter of integrity and ability, and is administered by the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation, especially created for this purpose.

Roger Lowe, a member of the staff of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Committee, made this year's award in memory of his father. I ask unanimous consent that Roger's presentation to the winner, Roger Van Noord, a junior at George Washington University, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Muir, Senator KENNEDY, Mr. Scripps, Mother, members of Sigma Delta Chi and distinguished guests, ever since Johannes Guttenberg took the press out of winemaking and put it into printing, men have made great advances in the field of journalism.

However, this vital profession cannot afford to rest on past accomplishments; cannot afford to use outdated methods; and most of all, cannot afford to neglect the injection of fresh blood into the ranks.

While my father, Herman Lowe, was the last man to take credit for his accomplishments, he was the first to encourage the training of new reporters.

Therefore, 4 years ago, when my family sought a fitting memorial to him, the idea of an annual scholarship was decided upon. Tonight, I am very pleased to present this award to Roger Van Noord. I hope you, Roger, will have the chance to carry the torch ahead.

Wheat and Bread**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any Member of this House intends to take a position against the farmer receiving something near a fair income for the contribution he makes to our health, to our economy, and to our well-being as a Nation. Our farm people are very important to all of us.

Agriculture has not shared in the Nation's prosperity, along with other great segments of our economy.

Over the past 17 years, prices received by farmers have dropped by 15 percent, while prices paid by consumers for food have increased 31 percent. During the last year, farm prices declined by another 3 percent in relation to 1947 prices, while consumer prices climbed another 2 percent.

Expenditures per person in the United States for food increased from \$312 in 1950 to \$417 in 1964. Of the \$105 more each person spent on food in 1964 than in 1950, marketing firms received \$104 and farmers received only \$1.

This is a very serious situation for our farmers, especially when we consider the great increases that have occurred in the cost of things they must buy to make their crops. For instance, in 1950 the farmer sold 1,185 bushels of wheat to buy a 30 to 39 belt horsepower tractor which then could be had for \$2,370; now it takes 2,053 bushels of wheat to pay for the same horsepower tractor which in 1964 carried a price tag of \$3,470.

In the House Committee on Agriculture, we have been working for days, weeks, and months, trying to devise ways of improving the farmers' position, at the least possible cost to our taxpayers and the Government. It is the only fair and equitable thing that we in the Congress can do.

But, Mr. Speaker, our task has been made exceedingly difficult. A great deal of erroneous and misleading information is being circulated around the country, confusing our citizens.

Along with the other people in agriculture, we are trying to improve the position of our wheat farmers. They now are getting less for their wheat than they did 15 years ago. But some people are spreading the word that when we improve the price for wheat farmers we are actually imposing a bread tax upon our consumers.

This question presents itself: Are we to repress and hold down our farmers forever, in the fear that by boosting their meager income, however slightly, someone will charge us with imposing a tax upon food?

Mr. Speaker, I have made these remarks by way of introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from the Secretary of Agriculture, which takes a very sharp look at the record where the wheat farmer and the wheat program are concerned. I recommend the very careful attention of each Member of this body to what the Secretary has to say. The text of his letter to me follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 1, 1965.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The wheat certificate program completed its first year June 30, with these results:

Wheat farm income for the 1964 crop year will be about \$450 million higher than would otherwise have been possible;

Program costs to the taxpayer were over \$300 million lower than in the previous fiscal year;

Publicly owned wheat stocks stored at public expense will total 725 million bushels, or some 150 million bushels fewer than at the end of the previous marketing year. Total wheat stocks currently are about 840 million bushels;

Profits to wheat users thus far in 1965, according to recent Standard & Poor surveys, are higher in nearly every case than for the same period in 1964;

Consumer prices for wheat products have remained stable. Bread prices in the past 12

months have averaged around 21 cents a loaf or less, virtually unchanged from the period before the certificate program went into effect; and

Wheat exports in the 1965 fiscal year are the second largest in history. Only the 1964 fiscal year, which included substantial sales to the Soviet Union, was larger.

In every respect the predictions which the administration made last year in support of the wheat certificate program have been borne out.

The same, however, cannot be said for the predictions of wheat users and others who opposed this legislation when it was under consideration by the Congress last year.

Let me quote some of those statements as they were made then:

A key opponent of the bill on the Senate floor said, "Under this bill, what, in effect, is being said by the Government is: 'Add 1 cent per loaf, no matter * * * how you do it.'"

The New York Times editorialized that "What all this means is higher costs for the consumer."

Interstate bakeries, whose per share earnings are currently running almost 65 percent higher than a year ago: "The consuming public * * * will be victims of inevitable price increases."

Continental Baking Co. said this legislation "can mean nothing but an increase in the price of bread to the consumer."

The Northwestern Miller editorialized that "Wheat prices will rise. And so flour will cost more."

These are only a few of the calamitous statements heard a year ago in an effort to defeat a bill, and all of them have been proven false by the most effective test possible—a year of practical operating experience.

I quote them now because the same dire predictions are being heard once again, this time in regard to the proposals now before the Congress to extend the wheat certificate program.

We have stated repeatedly that the new legislation would provide the wheat farmer an additional seven-tenths of a cent for the wheat used in a loaf of bread by domestic bakers. It will be the first time in 15 years that the wheat farmer has had an increase in his share of the returns from a loaf of bread. Since 1949, the cost of wheat in a loaf of bread has been 2.7 cents or less even though the cost of that loaf has increased from 14 to 21 cents currently.

Yet, the wheat users have threatened that if the share of the farmer is increased seven-tenths of a cent, the price of bread will be increased 2 cents a loaf.

This statement must be viewed in the context of the experience of the past year. The results of practical experience have borne out the position of the administration, just as future experience will bear out the statements which the administration is making in support of the current proposal.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

John Scott
Dedication and Commitment of Americans Serving in Vietnam

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. HUGH SCOTT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Loudon Wainwright wrote a poignant essay in the June 11 issue of Life magazine about

A3546

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 6, 1965

the dedication and commitment of the Americans serving in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A LITTLE PARCEL OF COMMITMENT

(By Loudon Wainwright)

I figure I had just about recovered from my brief trip to Vietnam when the letter came from a pilot I'd met during a 5-day visit to the carrier *Midway*. That is, I was getting over the shock of returning to a land where Cassius Clay's fight and JOHN LINDSAY's party loyalty are important topics. I had almost reached the point where I could read about the teachings without getting sore and had nearly stopped feeling hostile toward people who asked me wasn't Hong Kong a more swinging town than Saigon. In short, I was in the midst of a bland process of disengagement through homecoming. High school graduations, summer plans, and the bills had begun to resume their normal staggering priorities.

The letter from the pilot halted that process abruptly. Its most important paragraph read, "Your message of greetings was delivered to each man you named except Comdr. Jam LaHaye. I am grieved to report that Jim was killed on May 8 during a strike on Vinh Airfield. Jim rolled in on a flak suppression run just moments before our bombing runs. We dove through a barrage of antiaircraft and Commander LaHaye's aircraft was hit. He managed to fly to the coast, but glided into the sea without ejecting."

The strange gentleness of those final words took me right back to the carrier. They seemed especially appropriate to Jim LaHaye, with whom I had passed an afternoon about a week before he "glided into the sea without ejecting." Commanding officer of a squadron of F-8 Crusaders aboard the *Midway*, he was a thoroughly polite and modest man, and as he walked me around the flight deck and showed me his big jets with the shark's teeth painted around their engine intakes, he was so low pressure he could have been showing me a stand of tomato plants. But for all his quiet diffidence, the quality of total engagement was there. In the course of our conversation, LaHaye, 41, an Annapolis graduate and father of three, told me that he'd had a day ashore at Saigon recently. Instead of spending the night sacked out in an air-conditioned hotel or simply going out on the town, LaHaye bummed a ride in an armed helicopter and went off on an overnight visit to a friend who was an Army adviser at a particularly dangerous and exposed Vietnamese village.

I doubt that LaHaye attached any special importance to his visit. He wanted to see his friend and—beyond that—he wanted to have a look at the war from a vantage point other than his own. But his act illustrated for me a reality I saw everywhere in Vietnam. It is a one-subject, single-preoccupation country, and no American I talked to was much interested in anything but the struggle that is going on there. They bitch about the heat and the food, gab about home and sex, but mainly they are fascinated, even obsessed, with the problems at hand. Some people may say—quite wrongly I think—that many of these men are war lovers. It seems more logical to me that their vulnerable position at the very swordpoint of the conflict demands total engagement. They give it, and it is an astonishing thing to see. It is also contagious for the passer-by.

In Vinh Long, a Mekong Delta town 60 miles south of Saigon, many of the Americans live in a three-story building which serves as an advisers' hotel. The men there

are attached to Vietnamese units of many kinds: infantry, artillery, river forces, and they go back and forth almost daily between the hotel and their work, which is the continuous battle against the Vietcong who abound in the area. Armed commuters in jeeps, helicopters and boats, they go about the job of regularly exposing themselves to death in an utterly professional manner. The operations are planned and carried out without heroics or fanfare, and the lucky man can even get back in time for a shower before dinner. I suppose it's possible that danger as a routine way of life would be enormously attractive to some, but I found more compelling than that a sense of agreement among these men that they were engaged in necessary business.

This contagion of purpose extends beyond the military. I had dinner one night in Saigon at the apartment of a U.S. Operations Mission official whose wife had returned to the United States when the dependents were moved from Vietnam in February. With us at dinner was another official whose family had gone home, too. For much of the evening we talked about the USOM men who work in unprotected isolation in remote parts of the country, and we speculated about whether or not the Vietcong would begin a systematic campaign of harassment and murder against them. Until now they had not, but the heavy buildup of American forces might cause a retaliatory change. The conversation then shifted to the subject of what these two men would do when their tours of Vietnam duty were up, a matter of a few months in both cases. Both felt—absent families or not—that it was entirely possible they might decide when the time came that they must remain in Vietnam, that it would be close to desertion to leave.

The day before I left Vietnam I was drinking beer in a group that included two marine lieutenants, one an American, the other his Vietnamese counterpart. The American held his head as if he had a slightly stiffneck, and it turned out that a Vietcong bullet had grazed his cheek and jaw, entered the side of his neck and then emerged from the back of it, leaving a hole about 2 inches long. A couple of us, holding our beer bottles well away from the nearly healed wound, examined it, and when I remarked that it looked as if it itched, the marine agreed that it did. Then, tired of being the center of attention, he called out to the Vietnamese across the room: "Show 'em yours, Han. Show 'em yours." Smiling shyly, the Vietnamese marine unbuttoned his dungaree shirt and revealed two completely healed wounds high in his chest. Then he pointed to another on his right forearm and finally to a fourth on his right hand which made one of the fingers considerably shorter than it should have been. Members of an exclusive club, the two marines grinned at each other.

I did not envy them the price of initiation, but I do remember wishing that I somehow could extract for myself some small, civilian piece of their commitment. Away, now, from that one-subject country, back in the land of ghost punches and silly politics, a letter from a carrier tells me that I caught that little piece, and I hope I can keep it.

Bold Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most forward-looking pieces of social

legislation to be offered to Congress in years was President Johnson's housing proposal which passed the House on Wednesday, June 30.

This measure was strongly supported by the New Republic of June 3. In an editorial entitled "Bold Idea," this distinguished liberal magazine hailed the President's housing bill as "one of the boldest ever sent Congress."

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith the New Republic editorial and commend it to my colleagues and to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD generally:

BOLD IDEA

President Johnson is often accused of offering Congress only warmed-over Truman-Kennedy consensus ideas. This isn't so. The Johnson Federal rent subsidy program is one of the boldest ever sent Congress. Substandard tenements are universal in American slums. Hitherto the Government has half-heartedly tried to remedy this by building public housing—gaunt and institutional. It hasn't worked.

Now, Mr. Johnson has come up with a radical new idea in the omnibus housing bill. He would encourage nonprofit groups to build decent private housing, offered at standard rents. Families of modest means would get a supplement; i.e., subsidy, from the Government to help pay these rents. The subsidy would be flexible, to bridge the gap between an arbitrary one-fourth of the family's income, and the rent.

The Smiths, say, are an elderly couple. Total income, \$4,000. A nonprofit cooperative builds quarters which rent at \$1,400 a year. For the Smiths the Government pays a rent supplement of \$400 a year (the difference between 25 percent of their income, or \$1,000, and the \$1,400 rent). The Government's check goes to the cooperative, not to the Smiths.

The group aimed at is not the destitute or very poor; the latter are eligible for public housing. This is for the income scale above that: handicapped or elderly people, or those of moderate means jammed into slums. The guess is there are 4 million families in this category, including those people who have been displaced by Government operations. There will be 300,000 more persons displaced in the next 4 years. Some won't be able to get decent housing.

This is a new idea. It is intensely controversial. The time may not be ripe for it. But don't let it be said that Mr. Johnson offers only trite plans to Congress.

Republican Groups Urge Strong Voting-
Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, yesterday, the Council of Republican Organizations issued a statement urging their fellow Republicans in the House of Representatives to support the passage of a strong and really meaningful voting rights bill. Too many Americans have for far too long been denied this most fundamental right of our free society. I ask unanimous consent that an informative article on the council's statement, published in this morning's issue

July 6, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180014-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3553

tion, as we are proud of our independence for which much blood was shed.

The United States and Canada share the same continent with its vast resources, potentialities, history and customs, each nation completely independent yet banded together for the protection of our shores.

It is a privilege to serve as a member of the interparliamentary group and I have gained much insight and knowledge about mutual problems.

Happy birthday neighbors.

The President at the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson gave a reviving shot in the arm to the United Nations in his speech to the 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter.

The President's speech could not have been given at a better time. The Philadelphia Inquirer so truthfully wrote: "The President did not just say 'Many Happy Returns' and let it go at that. He gave the United Nations the best birthday gift it could receive: a sense of mission and dedication in a world that badly needs its offices. We can only hope the enthusiasm his speech engendered is an augury of new and more effective action."

I commend the Philadelphia Inquirer on their June 26, 1965, editorial entitled "The President at the U.N." and at this time place it in the Record:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 26, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT AT THE U.N.

The United Nations, which has been in a badly sagging state lately, received a revivifying booster shot from President Johnson at the ceremonies commemorating the 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter.

The United Nations has seemed to some observers to be sinking steadily into oblivion, unable even to furnish the appearance of a good debating society; inert and confused in the face of crisis; fumbling around in uncertainty even on how to get its members to pay their dues.

But the President wanted to make clear the continued U.S. support for the United Nations Charter. He wanted to make clear America's commitment to peace, and to the eradication of poverty, disease, and racial prejudices wherever they are present.

He called upon the United Nations to be the peacemaking and peacekeeping agency that it is supposed to be, and he placed before its member nations, in clear and unmistakable terms, the efforts made by the United States, and frustrated by the Communist powers, toward a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

There are members of the United Nations who have condemned the U.S. policy in southeast Asia; who have not been hesitant to tell us to stop the bombing, to deal with the Vietcong, to get out of Vietnam. At the same time, they have refused to acknowledge the part played by Red China and Red

North Vietnam in the Vietnamese aggression; they have found it impossible to criticize these powers for ignoring our offers of unconditional negotiation.

President Johnson did not hand the problem of Vietnam to the U.N. for solution. But he made it plain that any effective peace-seeking initiative by that organization would have American support. So would steps leading to disarmament, and to the curtailment of poverty. So would efforts to provide a peacekeeping body that would be prepared to cope with crisis, not in a matter of months and weeks, but in 24 hours.

The President did not just say, "Many happy returns" and let it go at that. He gave the United Nations the best birthday gift it could receive: A sense of mission and dedication in a world that badly needs its offices. We can only hope the enthusiasm his speech engendered is an augury of new and more effective action.

It's What's Happening, Baby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, apparently it was my good fortune to miss last week's controversial television show entitled "It's What's Happening, Baby." From news accounts and letters describing the 90-minute rock 'n' roll show about the administration's antipoverty program, the widespread criticism seems justified. One constituent wrote, "This program was and is a disgrace to civilized society. I hope you had the misfortune to see it."

Aside from the low entertainment value and question of morality, the most disturbing aspect is the fact that such an appeal must be made to trick our young people into improving their positions in life. Officials of the CBS television network and the Office of Economic Opportunity have associated the advantages to be gained from initiative and work with cheap emotional thrills and the latest dance crazes sweeping the country. It is doubtful that our Nation has reached such a decadent state that the youth of America would fall for such trumpery.

The June 30 edition of the Moultrie Observer carried a well-worded editorial on the subject which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

IT'S HAPPENING, BABY

A television show entitled "It's What's Happening, Baby" was presented a couple of nights ago with the purpose of directing teenage attention to the Office of Economic Opportunity which directs what is commonly called the "Poverty Program."

It was a shocker in its implications. The music was wild and woolly, but definitely of the sort which appeals to the teen crowd of this era, but that's beside the point. The shock was in the method of spoon-feeding young people with sugar-coated appeals to better themselves.

We cannot believe that this Nation has so deteriorated that a yell must be pulled across the art of initiative and work. If we have become such a handout society that we must trick young people into remaining in

school, learning trades, and bettering their position in life, then our American ways have become decadent and we are on the way out as a dynamic, virile Nation that places honest work and service to our fellowman above beatnik existence and hipster parties.

We are very much afraid many youngsters got the wrong idea from this show. Life wasn't intended to be one long, emotional thrill, and the shimmy, shake and twist won't accomplish any permanent progress.

It's happening, baby—but not for the best interests of young people and their futures. We suggest that the dropouts, the jobless, and those who haven't really been given a chance to prove their mettle put serious thought to the various programs offered through the Office of Economic Opportunity. Forget the hipsters and the hollersers, and concentrate on some worthy goal in life. The opportunities exist, but it is going to take a bit of digging and a measure of sacrifice to achieve a worthy goal. Let's not kid ourselves or the young people. They must work and strive for the better things. Handouts and parties won't do it.

Legal Services for the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the April-May issue of Trial, the publication of the American Trial Lawyers Association, carried an excellent article by Donald M. Baker, the General Counsel of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In his article, Mr. Baker discusses a problem which deserves more serious attention among members of the legal profession and among those of us holding public office—namely, the need for improved legal services for the poor.

As Mr. Baker points out, millions of Americans "have been effectively denied the right to counsel." He attributes this denial of legal rights to the conditions of poverty in which millions of our fellow citizens live.

Fortunately, many communities are moving to meet this problem through local antipoverty programs. It is my hope that more communities will consider establishing systems for providing legal services to the poor under their local community action programs.

I take great pleasure in calling Mr. Baker's article to the attention of my colleagues—first, because of the importance of its subject matter, and secondly, because Mr. Baker is a distinguished lawyer and member of the bar in my State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place the article which appeared under the headline, "Legal Rights for 40 Million Persons," in the Appendix of the Record:

LEGAL RIGHTS FOR 40 MILLION PERSONS—SEEKS TO EDUCATE MILLIONS IN THEIR LEGAL RIGHTS

(By Donald M. Baker)

Near the top of any list of basic American rights, most citizens, certainly most lawyers,

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180014-5

A3554

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 6, 1965

would place the right to counsel. By definition they would include not only the right to have an attorney in a criminal case, as guaranteed by the 6th and 14th amendments, but also the right to legal assistance in the defense and prosecution of civil suits, and the right to seek legal advice in a broad range of personal, social, and business matters.

Most of us believe that the existence of this right implies that most Americans actually enjoy it.

Outside the field of criminal law and, in fact, until the Supreme Court's decision in the Gideon case within that field as well, the fact is that millions of Americans, perhaps as many as 40 million, have been effectively denied the right to counsel. This denial is not the result of legislative fiat or government regulations. It results from poverty.

If we have thought of this matter at all, probably most of us have satisfied ourselves with the thought that the poor rarely need counsel except to defend themselves against criminal prosecution. They do not have businesses; they have little property to will or deed. They do not have automobiles to collide with others. Unhappily, however, the poor have other legal problems.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL

A few simple examples will illustrate the point. A man may lose his job at the post office, and with it security for his wife and children, because, without counsel, he does not follow appropriate appeal procedures.

An elderly couple may lose their right to social security, and with it their entire income when they are too old or ill to work, because when told they are not eligible, they are unaware of their right to challenge this determination.

A man charged with the misdemeanor of siphoning gas from an automobile may go to jail or receive a fine which he cannot pay because he did not have an attorney who could intercede with the local prosecutor and persuade him to drop the case. All these are relatively simple cases, easily handled, if the poor had counsel to represent them.

Far more difficult are the numerous situations where the substantive law is either unclear or restricts the rights of the poor. For example, landlord-tenant law, in its effects on the poor, is generally weighted heavily on the side of the landlord. Many commercial practices, not generally used by downtown stores, but followed by stores with which the poor generally deal, are grossly unfair, if not actually illegal. The vagrancy and loitering laws and many local welfare and public housing regulations are harsh in their application to the poor.

The poor, if they are actually to enjoy the same rights as the rest of us, must have representation with the imagination and aggressiveness to challenge the placing of such burdens on them.

Finally, there is a crucial area involving not only the lawyer but the social worker, consumer education expert, and others, who work with the problems of the poor. People in poverty suffer not only from a lack of representation; they fail to take advantage of representation even when it is available. The reason is simple. Even more than other laymen, they frequently fail to realize that they have a legal problem or, when they do, often they have no confidence that anyone, perhaps a lawyer least of all, would be willing to help. Consequently, any legal problems requires education of the poor in their legal rights and the effective ways they can be asserted.

LEGAL AID FAILS

It is, of course, true that legal aid and public defender offices have long made services available to the poor. However, while these offices have made real strides, for financial and other reasons they have rarely been able to provide legal services for all the poor in a particular locality as to all kinds of legal problems.

In addition, such services have generally not been decentralized in order to bring legal help into poor neighborhoods where it would be easily available.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, the President's principal weapon in the war on poverty, is committed to providing comprehensive opportunities and services for the poor. While adequate legal services will not themselves win this war, they are crucial. OEO does not itself formulate and run programs. But it hopes that with the interest and support of the American Trial Bar, local antipoverty programs will include, as a major component, a broad range of legal services for the poor.

The form these legal services take will in the individual case depend largely on the needs and desires of each particular locality. However, proposals which have already been made to OEO suggest ideas which local poverty programs may want to consider.

Many communities are proposing the establishment of new legal service offices in poor neighborhoods, frequently in centers providing a wide variety of other social services such as in the fields of employment, housing, and health.

These proposals frequently provide for legal services to the poor in meeting problems which now fall outside available help; e.g., in domestic relations cases, to questions concerning the action of welfare agencies, the inaction of housing authorities. Other communities are planning similar services to be provided through the expansion of existing legal aid programs.

Regardless of the method followed, such programs do frequently include programs for educating the poor to know when a legal problem is raised—and to know to come to the neighborhood lawyer before they act rather than after.

Proposals also frequently include studies of existing law in order to determine how it ought to be changed to give the poor the protection they need and deserve.

In short, throughout the country, there are programs and proposals to give the poor the same kind of broad and dedicated legal service as is available for the rest of the community.

The full effectiveness of these programs will necessarily depend, of course, upon the interest and support of the legal profession. Lawyers can initiate legal service programs in their communities for inclusion in the local community action program, give their ideas and support to make it work. They can and should contribute some of their own time directly to help the poor. Such an effort would be in the highest tradition of the American Trial Bar.

Ashton Thompson

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1965

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, just 6 days ago one of our colleagues, ASHTON THOMPSON, of Louisiana, was suddenly taken from us in a traffic accident near Gastonia, N.C. Only the day before we were together in this Chamber on business of the House of Representatives. Today we are here, but he is absent in person but present in our hearts. ASHTON was a good man, a devoted Member of this House, a true friend whose presence will be greatly missed by all of us. May his soul rest in peace.

To his family and to his friends, our deep sympathy in this hour of sorrow.

John R. Moses
Our Involvement in Vietnam and What It Means to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, a penetrating analysis of our involvement in Vietnam and what it means to Americans was presented to the County Veterans Service Officers Association of Wisconsin, meeting at Eau Claire, Wis., on June 18.

The very able director of the Wisconsin Department of Veterans' Affairs, John R. Moses, presented this analysis and challenge.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Moses' thinking on Vietnam, and the challenge Vietnam poses to all Americans, I insert his address in the RECORD:

JOHN R. MOSES' ADDRESS TO COUNTY VETERANS SERVICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, EAU CLAIRE, WIS., JUNE 18, 1965

A citizen in a free country has far more responsibilities than one living under tyranny, whether Communist style or that evolved under Hitler in Nazi Germany.

The continued successful functioning of a free government is the responsibility of every citizen. We must be well and correctly informed if we are to be expected to act wisely. And the free institutions we have developed in this land, the individual freedoms we enjoy, must be guaranteed to all within our land as firmly as we must defend them against all challenges from without.

When we veterans went into service we were given the heaviest responsibility a citizen in a free land can bear, a responsibility we undertook to discharge with our lives. All of us, whether we served as buck private or as an officer with rank, were given, and we assumed, the responsibility for fighting off and defeating an enemy who threatened our continued existence as a free Nation. We assumed that responsibility—and we discharged that responsibility—frequently with great discomfort, always inconvenienced, in the face of grave danger, and at great sacrifice. We permitted a mighty armed force to be made—and the challenge was thrown back, and the enemy defeated.

Many of those who served died, or were maimed—but the survivors, as citizens in a free land, cannot while they live lay down their responsibilities.

When we fought, we looked after our comrades in arms and they looked after us.

When we returned as veterans of the war, our responsibilities as citizens were continued with the years. The emphasis was changed perhaps, but if we would be true to our national traditions, we were still charged with the responsibility of keeping ourselves informed and of acting wisely upon that information in the national interest.

Our special experience did not endow us with any special military wisdom—but at the very least we bought with our experience a special stake in this great experiment of ours in a free democratic Government.

We became experts in recognizing the cost of war in values other than dollars and cents—the cost of winning, and the cost of losing.

July 6, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Without becoming military experts, we came out of the war charged as veterans with a special responsibility for the defense of our land—we turned in the uniform and the gun, but the heavy responsibility that was also issued to us when we put on the uniform remained and will remain.

In the years since the last formal war, we've been faced with many challenges from outside our borders. Today in Vietnam Americans are dying, and it becomes very important that we understand whether their deaths and the dangers our increasing involvement in somebody else's war are necessary to us, and what our proper course as a Nation should be.

At the outset some of the facts that I believe are incontrovertible must be examined, and some of the errors and misconceptions that exist must be corrected.

The war in South Vietnam is not a civil war, a rebellion from within the country, as in the case of our own revolution, against intolerable injustice, real or fancied. It is an invasion, first by diehard Communist agents trained and equipped in North Vietnam and more recently by regular units of the North Vietnamese Army. It is supplied by equipment and munition taken from ambushed units of the Government of South Vietnam, by food looted under threat of death from a helpless civilian population, and increasingly by Communist munitions and equipment smuggled in by the North Vietnamese.

What popular support the Vietcong movement has attracted, according to reliable information, has been the result of a murderous campaign of terror waged against the innocent people of South Vietnam on a broad scale.

The principal Vietcong effort has been a campaign of brutality and savagery deliberately aimed at destroying the will of the free people of South Vietnam to govern themselves. The war has been waged by the Vietcong principally against the civilian population, and only incidentally against the Vietnamese Army.

Thousands of village headmen, civilian administrators, and their helpless women and children have been murdered in cold blood. Civilian food stores have been looted or destroyed. Tens of thousands of the people of South Vietnam, both civilian and military, have been slaughtered.

The Government of South Vietnam is far from perfect. In spite of our best efforts it has never achieved much stability. Change by military coup has been the order of the day. Friction between religious groups has frequently paralyzed the orderly transaction of public business.

But democratic processes have been kept alive, imperfect as they may appear to us with our 200 years of democratic tradition.

In the past 10 years tremendous progress has been made in improvement and development of public education, medical services, industrial growth, agricultural production—and the democratic processes have been kept alive and strengthened.

Following the example of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, President Johnson has taken a firm and decisive stand in support of the free people of South Vietnam.

Our economic and military commitment has been well known. Support by both parties in the Congress has been nearly unanimous.

Public support of the President's position, as indicated by Gallup poll samplings, has been consistently felt by a strong majority.

And yet in this country there has been shrill opposition to our position in South Vietnam particularly on college campuses throughout the land.

Many thoughtful, responsible men and women have serious reservations about the correctness of our position both on moral and strategic grounds, and have been sincere in their opposition. Many of us, whether we

support the President or not, have been bewildered and frustrated when the ceaseless struggle for control in the Government of South Vietnam makes it appear that the Vietnamese don't want to help themselves, that our sincere efforts to help them have been futile.

This basis for opposition we can understand, and we must accept if our vaunted freedom of thought and freedom of expression are to mean anything. We may not agree with what the sincere doubters say, but we must defend their right to say it.

There are others, however, who have no commitment to our free institutions, who work for an ideology totally foreign to us, and who will do anything to see our Nation discredited and to give comfort to the enemy.

They are not large in numbers, but they are clever and persistent.

They use specious arguments to advance their point of view, but their very lack of scruples, their lack of dedication to the truth, gives them great flexibility and great initial advantage.

They are a new generation of the same breed who urged us to intervene against Hitler prior to the partition of Poland, and who the following morning could find no fault with Communist Russia's new ally.

The resurgence on the college campuses throughout our land of Communist-oriented youth groups is evidence that even after a decade of near-peaceful coexistence with Communist Russia we cannot lower our guard.

That these Communist-oriented youth groups should use the reservations to our present course expressed by sincere patriots is to be expected. Throughout the world one of their most effective techniques has been to intrude their disciplined action-units into well-meaning non-Communist organizations and movements—to use, incite, influence.

With carefully thought-out slogans, a gentle push in the right direction, a skillfully planned incident, democratic groups have been arrayed against democratic institutions and democratic governments.

We have recently witnessed the skill of their techniques—the audacity of their approach—the success of their efforts.

While American servicemen serving our Government at the request of a duly constituted allied government in the defense of a helpless civilian population against foreign attack have been ambushed and killed by bombs and savage attacks in the night—while American civilian technicians working to improve agricultural and industrial and administrative methods in a backward land have been kidnaped and tortured and murdered—otherwise responsible and loyal Americans have protested only the alleged immorality of our actions.

The poor people of a land invaded by a savage foe merit not a tear—the American servicemen who are wounded or killed by murderous attacks of an invader merit not a tear or a word of sympathy.

To them it is the invader and the trained agents of the invader who are being mistreated. To them the criminal act is our napalm or bomb attacks on the jungle hide-outs of the Vietcong guerrillas who the night before, perhaps, assaulted a peaceful village, beheaded its headman and his family as bloody examples, and slunk back into the night, leaving the village aflame and reeking with death.

The danger to this Nation and to the free world is not that we commit such force as may be necessary to defend Vietnam at the risk of escalating the war, but that we may not act decisively.

As real estate, South Vietnam is not worth a single American dollar or a drop of American blood. As the test of our dedication to freedom, of the good faith of our commitments, of the dependability of our alliances,

South Vietnam is worth everything we must put into the fight to win the war there.

If the Vietcong and the invaders from the north react to our determination with greater outrage, we must extend our defensive commitment and our deterrent effort. If the Red Chinese intervene with a massive commitment of manpower, we must use such means at our disposal, no matter how fearful, as will effectively put an end to that commitment, as we would shoot one who invades our home and ignores our warning and advances upon us knife-in-hand, in the belief that we dare not pull the trigger.

As citizens we have a responsibility to be well informed so that through us our Nation may act wisely. But if we would enjoy our free institutions we also have a responsibility to protect them for all others within our land, so that freedom of thought and of expression, however we may disagree with that thought or that expression, is guaranteed to all Americans.

No matter how strong our disagreement may be with sincere expressions by others of concern or opposition to our present course in South Vietnam, we dare not interfere with the right of any Americans to speak out freely. Freedom of expression is a fragile thing and does not flourish in the face of fear or coercion, and freedoms denied to any of us endangers the continued enjoyment of those freedoms for us all.

As veterans we must bear from our personal experience in time of war a large measure of responsibility to see that our Nation's goals are sound and that our Nation's defenses, wherever the lines may of necessity be drawn, are strong enough to meet all challenge.

Our Inept International Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents attended the International Air Show in Paris and shared with me his reaction. Because he is an exceptional citizen, businessman, and scientist; because his views are usually accurate; because he is genuinely concerned and because he is as knowledgeable as anyone else in the field, I want to share his views with Members of the Congress.

I hope that someone, somewhere in the Federal Government will heed his simple but profound suggestions:

JUNE 29, 1965.

Hon. BURT L. TALCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BURT: I have just returned from 12 days at the International Air Show held at Le Bourget Airport in Paris and am writing to advise you of the situation as I saw it from the standpoint of an American businessman spending 8 to 10 hours a day in an exhibit booth with the purpose of selling our products to the European market. Like John Glenn, I still get a lump in my throat when the flag goes by and we raise it every morning at our plant to remind us of our heritage and blessings. But, Burt, after 12 days in Paris, the gross stupidity, incredible arrogance and general ineptitude of our Government representation made me almost cringe at the mention of the United States of America. This is inexcusable. By and large, the American business representatives were doing

A3556

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 6, 1965

a creditable and possibly an outstanding job, but in spite of, not because of, our official bungling.

Let's face it. At Paris the Russians made us look like idiots and we cooperated so beautifully that it almost looked as though our public relations program was being directed by the Kremlin. Let's look at the facts:

First, we'll examine the Russian program:

1. Immediately after debarking at Le Bourget, I walked through the aircraft park where the Russian and American exhibits were practically side by side. The Russian aircraft were exclusively commercial, the American almost 100 percent military. Think of the irony of the situation. The United States, which has pioneered, built and has flying, more commercial aircraft than all the rest of the world combined being outgamed by a country that still puts bombardier nose sections in the few commercial aircraft that they have produced.

2. There was a long line waiting to enter the small, separate building that housed the space exhibit of the U.S.S.R. and I joined it. Inside was a full scale model of the Vostok space capsule and its rocket motor suspended from the ceiling, what appeared to be an operational Vostok in a glass case and Mr. Gagarin, Russia's first man in space, who shook my hand, said da da and gave me a Vostok lapel pin. This was easily the most popular exhibit at the show and I would estimate that 70 percent of the attendees had Vostok pins and were wearing them. I laid mine down and it was promptly stolen which is more than I can say for our U.S. publicity handouts.

3. The Russians then flew in their great mlssshapen 750 passenger transport aircraft which really impressed the public. I examined it and as a pilot and engineer of many years standing, I feel it economically and militarily foolish, but the publicity value was tremendous.

4. Then there was the announcement of the proposed U.S.S.R., SST transport which looks like a retouched Concorde. This also hit all of the front pages.

In short, the Russians stole the show with an obsolete space capsule much inferior to our Mercury, an artist's sketch of a supersonic transport and an overgrown, awkward monstrosity of an airplane. But they could do it because everything they did was aimed at and shown to the general public.

Now let us look at our notable contribution as ugly Americans.

1. A huge sign proclaiming "Aerospace U.S.A." hung over a complex of box-like private offices located not far from the American Avitron booth where Hoxlex exhibited. The doors of the offices had charming signs such as Chief Press Officer, Assistant Chief Press Officer, etc., and were always closed. There was one open section, staffed by the Department of Commerce with literature, handouts, etc. The public attendance in this area was notably sparse.

2. The same complex contained a very small, about 10 by 20 foot area, unventilated and hot, where a motion picture projector and a few chairs provided an uncomfortable and intermittent opportunity to see some very good American films. Due to location, environment, and lack of publicity, this was also very poorly attended.

3. When the truly magnificent, color film of White's space walk was finally received and shown late on Friday afternoon, it was treated like a secret. I found out about it quite by accident and then had to borrow a press badge from a British friend in order to see it. This, despite the fact that Hoxlex manufactured vital parts for the Gemini mission. Needless to say, the general public probably never knew it was there.

4. When White, McDivitt, and the Vice President finally arrived, it was a triumphant tour surrounded by Secret Service, press, public relations and photographers and the great

mass of the unwashed public including the exhibitors were generally ignored and forgotten.

5. As a part of the combined American Avitron-Hoxlex contributions to export sales and international good will, we presented a film, lecture, and demonstration on 2 separate days in the main auditorium as Les Bourget. As a matter of courtesy, we provided full information to the "Aerospace U.S.A." public relations staff on Tuesday and we were informed that "this was great stuff, just what we wanted, etc." On Thursday afternoon, having heard or seen nothing further from the public relations staff, we contacted them again. They didn't remember who we were, couldn't find the information we had provided and generally made us feel as welcome as the proverbial "skunk at a garden party." Naturally, if any publicity did appear, we didn't see it. In fact, the lectures were fairly well attended due to our own efforts and it appeared that our friends from the U.S.S.R. and the mainland of China were more interested than our own people since there was a good attendance from both of these organizations, but not a single U.S. press or public relations man on either day.

6. As to the net effect of the mass visit of Congressmen and Senators and the impact of the Ambassador's reception, the less said, the better.

There were a few good points. James Webb, Administrator of the NASA, visited the U.S. exhibitors. He came unheralded and alone, and had time to stop and talk for a few minutes without the aid of 50 photographers. In this, Jim was unique among the U.S. officials and should be commended. The USAF Thunderbirds and the U.S. Navy Blue Angels put on fantastic flying exhibitions on Thursday evening. But it occurred around 7:30 p.m. when most of the public had departed.

The point is this. The Russians appealed to the people; we ignored the people and appealed to the press. As a result, the Russians only lost the front pages once and that was when we made them through the unfortunate crash of our B-58.

The real tragedy lies in the fact that we have so much to be proud of and so much to give. We are first in aviation and I am not willing to concede that we are second in space. Just suppose we had forgotten the public relations experts, the mimeograph machines, the press handouts, and the missiles and the fighters and had chosen the following:

1. Wiped out all the cozy little offices and enclosures of "Aerospace USA," placed a dias in the center of the open area, hung a Gemini overhead and had three or four back projection machines showing White's space walk on a continuous schedule. Have White and McDivitt there 15 minutes every hour to talk with and shake hands with the people. That would have been the hit of the show.

2. Park a DC-8, a 707, a 727, an Electra, etc., on the ramp and let people through to see how we fly in the United States. The contrast with the commercial aircraft of the U.S.S.R. would have been enlightening. Have one plane equipped with the in-flight movie setup with an appropriate 5-minute color film. I realize that these aircraft are operating in Europe, but not many of the European people have flown in them.

3. Have a display of our amazing array of scientific satellites with an explanation of their purpose and their value to the human race.

4. Have the United States officially represented only by people with some capabilities in a language other than their own, with a real desire to communicate with and interact with the Europeans and with a real pride in the United States without arrogance or condescension.

It is my feeling that we are citizens of

what is still the greatest Nation on earth. We have our problems and make our mistakes, but basically, we believe in and practice those freedoms which are and have been the hope and goal of all mankind. We are also the world's greatest salesman. How long is it going to take our Government to use the commonsense practiced daily by the successful American businessman abroad to combine our principles and salesmanship in an irresistible package that can be marketed to the people of the world, not mimeographed as a press handout?

I am sorry that this letter had to be written. I would feel far better if it could have been one of praise rather than condemnation. However, I could not feel that I am doing my job as a citizen if I did not call the glaring deficiencies mentioned herein to the attention of the responsible Members of Congress with an earnest plea for prompt and remedial action.

With my sincere best wishes.

HOLEX INC.,
E. J. STRECKER,
President.

Malawi Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, July 6 is a significant day in the history of Malawi; for on that day in 1964 Great Britain effectively granted independence to the Malawian people. Today, only 2 days after we Americans have commemorated for the 189th time our own Declaration of Independence from England on July 4, 1776, Malawi celebrates its first anniversary of constitutional self-government. At this time, I should like to express my admiration for the achievements of the Malawian people in their 1 short year as a free member of the British Commonwealth and the community of nations.

The years since the end of World War II have seen the erosion of numerous colonial empires and the birth of many new nations. In some independence has brought problems which have all but aborted the goals dreamed of by the people during their years of subservience to foreign rule. New-born Malawi is an outstanding example of what a free people with determination and will, led by a man of foresight, understanding, and intelligence can accomplish. I speak, of course, of the distinguished Prime Minister of Malawi, the George Washington of his country, Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda.

Indeed, Malawi stands proudly as a symbol of democratic representative government and as a vital example of the republican system succeeding in a newly established state. The Malawian people did not achieve their independence without much effort, sacrifice, and determined hard work. While the transition from colonial sovereignty to self-determination was relatively smooth, it came only after the raj had been convinced time and again, by actual demonstration, that Dr. Banda and his followers were both willing and able to assume

July 6, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3557

the responsibilities to be transferred to them. Malawi's freedom came in gradual stages. From 1953 to 1963 it was a member—along with Northern and Southern Rhodesia—of a federation. At that time it was called Nyasaland.

Malawi moved toward autonomy with a constitutional conference held in London in 1960. In 1961, in accordance with the convention, elections for a new legislative council were held. Dr. Banda and his Malawi Congress Party received the mandate of the electorate and assumed the leadership of the new Executive Council.

In 1962, a second constitutional conference was held in London. This meeting resulted in a declaration of intent by the British articulating their determination to give Malawi domestic self-determination in early 1963. Shortly thereafter England made public its willingness to allow Malawi to secede from its union with the Rhodesias.

Step by step, the British assisted in the establishment of a ministerial, unicameral system of government with the Prime Minister, Dr. Banda, as Head of Government. In October of 1963, with a constitution promulgated, Great Britain announced its intention to grant Malawi its independence on July 6 of the following year.

Today, Malawi, which became a member of the United Nations on December 1, 1964, is an emancipated constituent of the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Prime Minister Banda and the Malawian people deserve the heartiest congratulations and best wishes of the American people on this anniversary date.

Public Service by KABC-TV**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB**
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, station KABC-TV, Los Angeles, Calif., recently rendered a unique public service to the southern California community which I am sure will be of general interest to communities and cities nationally.

This service, as is often the case, had its inception as a project to fill a need and, for a variety of reasons, grew into something much bigger. It began when the station was interested in informing the school systems of certain of its community service activities relating to subjects such as high school guidance clinics, scholarships, dropouts, a search for teenage reporters, and so forth. Surprisingly, it was found that there was no listing of institutions of higher education readily available for use in connection with such a project. KABC-TV itself therefore stepped in to fill the breach and compiled such information in an attractive and informative booklet "College Handbook—A Guide to Schools of Higher Education in Southern California."

The handbook devotes a page to each of the institutions of higher education in southern California, including a picture of a campus scene and a brief description of the institution. Also included is information in outline form concerning degrees awarded by the various institutions, entrance requirements, tuition, living accommodations, whether it has a religious affiliation, and where to write for additional information.

KABC-TV initially printed 10,000 copies of the very useful booklet. The response has been so enthusiastic from educators, libraries, students, parents, businessmen, and civil leaders, however, that an additional printing of 10,000 copies has become necessary.

I believe that station KABC-TV, Vice President and General Manager Elton H. Rule, and his associates merit commendation for this unique and worthwhile project. The popularity of the booklet attests very well to the success of the venture. Certainly it exemplifies too the measure of service that can be rendered to the public by organizations, whether they be private or public, when there is motivation and dedication.

Centennial of The Nation Magazine**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today "a weekly journal devoted to politics, literature, science, and art" began publication. Since that time the Nation, the oldest continuously published weekly of opinion in the United States, has gained a respected position in American journalism as well as in domestic affairs.

The Nation was the first, and has been the most consistent supporter of civil rights. Its sixth editor, Oswald Garrison Villard, for example, was a founder of the NAACP. Also, this organization was first housed in the Nation's offices.

Since its beginning, the Nation has championed and has been the forum for the causes of freedom and progress and has sought to expose those forces which it felt were damaging not only to this country but to the free world as well. The Nation, however, has taken not the ideological view so much as the moral view against racism, imperialism, political machines and super-patriotism. It criticized the U.S. Marine occupation of Haiti, exposed the Black and Tan terror in Ireland, fought McCarthyism and assorted "witchhunts." It was among the first American publications to illuminate the evils of Mussolini and Hitler.

This policy was first begun by E. L. Godkin, its founding editor. Godkin, a Manchester liberal, deeply believed in "peace, retrenchment and reform." What he mainly attempted to reform was American journalism, particularly the daily press which he believed to be in-

accurate and immoderate. For his models, he chose two outstanding publications—the Spectator, an English publication of opinion, and the American Saturday Review. Godkin thought the Nation's function would be to take a consistently hard critical view, to be scholarly but topical, and to create its own small but influential audience by maintaining a consistently virtuous position.

From its inception, the Nation has taken an independent position. The original prospectus for the publication stated, for example:

The Nation will not be the organ of any party, sect or body. It will, on the contrary, make an earnest effort to bring to the discussion of political and social questions a really critical spirit, and to wage war upon the vices of violence, exaggeration, and misrepresentation by which so much of the political writing of the day is marred.

A review of the 200 bound volumes comprising the Nation's history reveals contributions by a roster of distinguished writers and editors such as James Russell Lowell, Henry W. Longfellow, John G. Whittier, Francis Parkman, Lord Bryce, Henry James—Senior and Junior—William James, Charles Francis Adams, Carl Schurz, and many others.

Thus, this fine publication has made an outstanding contribution to American journalism, domestic politics, and international affairs. Its independence is particularly noteworthy and has been consistently maintained. As its current editor, Mr. Carey McWilliams, has stated:

The Nation belongs to no one * * * you cannot own it.

It is with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I congratulate the Nation on successfully completing 100 years of continuous and exceptional publication. Knowing that it begins its second century with the same spirit and goals that motivated its sponsors in 1865, I wish it all success and good fortune.

South Africa's Challenge**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include at this point an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "South Africa's Challenge."

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the reaction voiced in that editorial, and urge this Government to maintain its strong stand against discriminatory racial policies, whether here or abroad.

The editorial follows:

SOUTH AFRICA'S CHALLENGE

With a self-righteousness bordering on a death wish, South African Prime Minister Verwoerd's government, during the past month, has exhibited a determination to add

A3558

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 6, 1965

the United States to the long list of nations it wants nothing to do with.

In mid-May, when the United States routinely asked for permission for the planes from the U.S. carrier *Independence* to land on South African airstrips during a scheduled Capetown docking, South Africa replied yes, providing the crews were pure white. The *Independence* thereupon bypassed Capetown.

Subsequently, both Prime Minister Verwoerd and Foreign Minister Muller repeated statements of rebuke against the U.S. Embassy which persisted in holding interracial parties on its premises in defiance of South Africa's apartheid policies for separating blacks from whites. Although the warnings came just before the big Embassy Fourth of July party, the U.S. Government declined to rearrange its hospitality procedures.

In a recent statement before a Nationalist Party golden jubilee gathering of farmers, Verwoerd warned that South Africa would not tolerate any American Negroes on either the Defense Department or National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) tracking stations in South Africa.

Neither the NASA agreement of 1960, nor the defense agreement of 1962 contains any mention of racial policies. Moreover, no American Negroes ever have been assigned to the stations. And if they were, Verwoerd's government, which grants the necessary visa, obviously would have a veto power.

In sum, Verwoerd seems determined to pick a fight. As this year's elections already are out of the way, and with substantial increases in his party's popularity, Verwoerd apparently is picking a fight for other reasons.

Since 1957, the United States has joined in on stronger and stronger United Nations condemnatory resolutions against South Africa's apartheid policy—although never to the point of imposing severe sanctions. In 1962, the United States stopped the sale of U.S. arms to South Africa which could be used to enforce apartheid. And a year later it broadened this embargo to include equipment and machinery for the manufacture and repair of arms.

Now, Verwoerd seems determined that the United States publicly acknowledge its quiet practice of not assigning any Negroes to the tracking stations, a rather mortifying request of a nation which is trying so hard to enforce racial equality at home.

If the issue must be joined, let Washington now take stock of just how important South Africa is to U.S. interests. There is considerable trade between the two countries and at the moment the balance is very favorable to the United States. The tracking stations undoubtedly are useful, both scientifically and militarily. But U.S. trade is not that dependent on South Africa. And there are other, and friendlier, areas of the world where similar tracking stations can be set up.

In short, if Prime Minister Verwoerd and his government are determined to isolate themselves from a United States which cannot condone their racial policies, let them do it.

Fe [Signature]
The Search and Destroy Policy on the
Ground in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the July 1,

1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The policy of this administration in Vietnam is a logical one and there appears to be no question that we do not intend to lose.

The editorial follows:

Vietnam: "SEARCH AND DESTROY"

The U.S. role in the Vietnamese war has entered a new and broader phase with the allied invasion of the Vietcong jungle stronghold known as D zone. We have escalated the war in the air by taking the offensive against military targets in North Vietnam. We are now escalating our role on the ground by taking the offensive against Communist guerrillas in the south.

There appears to be some nervousness on the part of spokesmen in Saigon and Washington. They are reluctant to acknowledge that something has changed; that something new has been added. They cling to the references and terminology of the past—official pronouncements describing the function of American forces as essentially defensive, to protect our installations and personnel.

However, in speaking of the incursion into D zone, a State Department spokesman referred to it as a search-and-destroy mission. This can be squared with the previous formal position only by relating it to the classical military doctrine that the best defense is the offense.

The question is whether an offense on the ground is essential to achieving our purpose in Vietnam—to uphold the independence of South Vietnam and to deny the area south of the 17th parallel (as fixed by the Geneva agreements) to the Communists. The jungle is forbidding, filled with the darkness and danger from Communist guerrillas, snakes and swamps. Americans are extremely reluctant to see their young men sucked into such treacherous terrain.

A number of Republican critics suggest this can be avoided and victory can be achieved more cheaply by massive attacks on North Vietnam from the air and the sea. The President's military advisers evidently do not accept this over-simplified view; they contend that operations on the ground—which is, after all, where the Vietcong operate—are no less essential than air strikes against sources of supply in the north.

But this does not invalidate demands for more forceful measures against legitimate military targets in the north. If the two go hand in hand, complementing each other, in the absence of a favorable response to our repeated invitation to negotiations, it is logical to suppose that intensified efforts on the ground will be accompanied by stepped-up action from the air.

New Hampshire—Leader in Tree Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one who has had a lifelong interest in conservation and the development of natural resources, I read the following editorial from the Claremont Daily Eagle with great interest and some pride. The tree-farm concept is a growing one that is contributing increasingly to the health of the land and the economy of our area. I operate a tree farm myself and am,

therefore, especially pleased to note the progress in this area and to place this editorial in the RECORD.

NO. 2 TREE FARM STATE

New Hampshire, with 485 tree farms, continues to maintain a firm grip on second place both in acreage and number in the New England States, according to figures released at the tree farm committee's spring meeting.

This is good news for the Granite State and its residents. It shows that acreage, far from being cut back by encroachment of public ownership, as is true in so many other States, is actually increasing.

New Hampshire, as of this writing, has 485 tree farms, totaling 514,091 acres. It has added 6 new properties, with an acreage of 3,866, during the past year. And it might be noted that the major plot, measuring better than 2,000 acres, was acquired by a Bay State concern in the Sullivan County town of Goshen.

The American tree farm system, launched in Washington State in 1941, has since spread to all 48 contiguous States, with 29,000 ownerships representing total holdings of over 65 million acres.

As was recently noted here, State and Federal Governments are constantly acquiring private lands. Joint holdings of these two agencies amount to approximately 39 percent of the land in the United States—a percentage which is, naturally, exempt from taxation.

Conversely, each tree farm acre is privately owned and is contributing to tax receipts.

And, in the words of the Granite State Forest Industries Committee:

"Our tree farms stand as excellent examples of private enterprise demonstrating the practicability of multiple-use forest management. Their primary purpose is to grow wood for an expanding economy, but they also serve as habitat for wildlife, watershed for our streams and lakes, and provide hunting, fishing, camping, and other forms of recreation for our citizens."

K. D. W.

A Positive View of the Johnson Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson doctrine of standing up to communism in Latin America has received wide support throughout the Nation, and particularly in Florida where we are so close to Cuba and can remember the events preceding the Castro takeover. There have been, however, some negative press reports, similar to those which helped build up the Castro image in this country prior to his communistic declarations. The Miami Herald recently commented on the positive aspects of the President's actions and results in the Dominican Republic and I include this editorial in the RECORD:

LET'S VIEW IT POSITIVELY

The commitment of the United States in the Dominican Republic, in manpower, prestige, and resources, is tremendous. The stakes are incalculable.

In the circumstances, it is necessary to reserve judgments while we move cautiously and surely toward a solution that not only means freedom for the Dominican people but